

Libby Area Technical Assistance Group, Inc.
PO Box 53, Libby, MT 59923
June 8, 2004 Meeting Notes

SDMS Document ID



2031001

(Note bold items within paragraphs are action items agreed upon.)

1) Call to Order (7:00 pm)

2) Review and Approval of May 25, 2004 Minutes:

Minutes were reviewed, no corrections were recommended. Red made a motion to accept the minutes and Jan second the motion. Motion passed.

3) Paul Rumelhart – Stimson Property:

- a) Areas of concern regarding the clean up include: a) old nursery, b) maintenance shed, c) rail spur (capped?), and d) hydrocarbons.
- b) The land and buildings was acquired in December 2003 by Stimson to the City of Libby.
- c) Stimson still has a finger-joint operation, employing approximately 26-28 employees. They are looking to expand their operations.
- d) There are three class 3 landfills, two are 14 acre humps back filled with clay and lumber material; and one is an active landfill at the riverbank, there are monthly PH tests being conducted to measure ash content.
- e) A question for Libby – “What are we going to do with it?”
 - i) CTA is a contracting firm for a land use plan.
 - ii) Some areas cannot be redeveloped due to it being on a flood plain or it has no base.
 - iii) A number of economic and job opportunities are being developed, up to a point until an assessment is completed for land use.
 - iv) CTA “next week” (week of June 14th) will have civil, electric, and structure engineers to help evaluate the property and buildings.
 - v) An evaluation of available utilities, fiber, sewer, and fire suppression, waste and electrical will be conducted.
 - vi) The week after next (week of June 21st) will begin a public process of what the community wants.
 - vii) The Port Authority doesn’t “own” any property, but manages and plans land use. Currently monies were borrowed (\$96,000) at \$8,000/month to begin this process. In addition a Port Authority fee is tariffed in lieu of taxes for operating costs.
 - viii) Extensive costs were incurred to maintain the fire suppression system and a new roof for a building (\$13,000). The bid to replace two roofs was \$132,000. The electrical expenses are approximately \$12,000/month. The Port Authority is currently paying for \$1,000/month.
 - ix) Additional grants have been applied for to help cover costs of this property.
 - x) To keep open communications, TAG can contact City Hall (Heidi) for Port Authority Meeting Minutes.
- f) The property has 12.5Kv electric feed.
- g) Are there recreation opportunities? Motor cross, ATV, currently has a one-year temporary use of some of the property.
- h) Monitoring of air and soil samples will be conducted during the land development stages.

- 4) New Business:
- a) EPA meeting on Wednesday, June 9th, 2004 at the Ponderosa Room at 10:30.
 - b) **A meeting is to be held on Friday at Henry's Restaurant to complete contract reviews for the Executive Board.**
 - c) **An audit will need to be conducted, it was decided that Mike, JoElyn, Abe and Cheryl would be on this audit committee. Red made the motion and LeRoy second the motion.**
 - d) **Abe, Gordon and Jan will complete questions for Leavitt visit.**
 - i) Wendy Thomi needs a list of current LATAG Board Members.
 - e) Cheryl gave a report regarding the upcoming workshop for Board Members, continued discussion will be held during the meeting Friday at Henry's.
 - i) It was decided that this workshop will be held before August, and possibly the first week or two of July. Between the 12th and 15th one evening between 6:00 and 10:00pm.
 - ii) Short term technical assistance rather than have another contract.
 - iii) May reimbursement is still needed for submission.
- 5) Old Business:
- a) Policy and Procedures: it was decided to have five elected board members or officers; currently there are only four officers. It was decided to have one additional "Executive At Large"; it was decided to have Lester fill this position.
 - b) Gordon will supply additional three-ring binders for board members to organize LATAG material (these should be available at the end of the week).
 - c) Second Hand Store: this material was reported to be put into the city dump. It is EPA's understanding that it went to the asbestos landfill. EPA will check on if other material went to the city dump. Removal of the material cost EPA more after it burned down than what it would have cost for removal. Parameter monitoring was conducted during the fire; EPA will forward these results to Gordon.
 - i) Both the Mayor and the police were involved in keeping spectators from the area and possible asbestos contamination.
 - ii) It is unknown why Lincoln County does not conduct monitoring.
 - d) Discussion followed regarding the cost of what MarCor pay employees vs. what MarCor is being paid for removal of the material.
 - e) A community response will be needed for the Risk Assessment during the next board meeting.
 - i) LATAG will hold a discussion prior to the Risk Assessment being forwarded to EPA. This response will be available tomorrow afternoon.
 - ii) Community support will be needed, regarding LATAG's position and PLM. This will be available two weeks before the Denver Colorado trip.
 - f) Les held a discussion regarding the removal of asbestos from properties, definition of "non-detect", and the cause of dust and air borne particles.
 - i) An extensive discussion followed regarding quality control of the asbestos removal.
 - ii) It is most cost effective to remove it the first time, do it the best you (EPA, CDM, MarCor) can the first time.

Next meeting is scheduled for July 13th 7:00, Community College.

A motion to adjourn the meeting was held at approximately 9:30 p.m.